# STATE OF MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE/LAW ENFORCEMENT

2015 - 2016



## EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT (JAG) EVALUATION PLAN

Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director Missouri State Highway Patrol, Statistical Analysis Center

Funding for this report was provided by the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program through the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance; Award #2014-MU-BX-0858

January 2016

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| INTRODUCTION   | 3  |
|--|----|
| PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS                                |    |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS                                   | 4  |
| PROSECUTION AND COURT PROGRAMS                             | 10 |
| PREVENTION AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS                          | 11 |
| CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS             | 13 |
| DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS                                    | 14 |
| PLANNING, EVALUATION AND TECHNCOLOGY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS. | 16 |
| CRIME VICTIM AND WITNESS PROGRAMS                          | 18 |

#### INTRODUCTION

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program provides criminal justice authorities with substantial support in their endeavors to address Missouri's illicit drug and violent crime problems. The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) administers this program at the federal level and the Missouri Department of Public Safety (DPS) administers it at the state level. In Missouri, the unit that administers this program within the DPS-Office of Director is known as the Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement (CJ/LE) Program and will be referred to as CJ/LE throughout this report.

Program evaluation is an essential CJ/LE responsibility required by its enabling legislation. To meet this responsibility, BJA has provided states with guidelines, technical training, and support for assessing JAG-funded programs. In Missouri, the DPS has contracted with the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP), Research and Development Division (RDD) to administer the evaluation component of the CJ/LE Program. Within RDD, the responsibilities are delegated to the Statistical Analysis Center (SAC). SAC plays a major role in the development of Missouri's drug and violent crime strategy and the evaluation of the JAG programs

This evaluation plan provides a description of FY16 JAG project evaluation designs developed by SAC and DPS. These evaluations are mostly administrative or process in nature.

## LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

This purpose area focuses on policing and multi-jurisdictional, multi-agency counter drug enforcement effort, with emphasis placed on collaboration and partnerships within the multi-jurisdictional approach to drug enforcement. Because problems associated with illicit drugs transcend boundaries, partnerships have been forged to combat the illicit drug problems within Missouri. A comprehensive understanding of responsibilities and expectations by task force partners is established with memorandums of understanding/agreements between all partners of multi-jurisdictional enforcement groups

#### Efficiency evaluation designed for:

1. Jackson County - Drug Abatement Response Team (DART)

#### Drug Task Force (DTF) Quarterly Status Report Automated Information System designed for:

- 1. Audrain County East Central Drug Task Force (ECDTF)
- 2. Board of Police Commissioners MO Western Interdiction and Narcotics (MoWIN) Task Force
- 3. Brookfield City North Missouri (NOMO) Drug Task Force
- 4. Buchanan County Buchanan County Drug Strike Force
- 5. Camden County Lake Area Narcotics Enforcement Group (LANEG)
- 6. Cole County Mid-Missouri Unified Strike Team and Narcotic Group (MUSTANG)
- 7. Farmington City Mineral Area Drug Task Force (MADTF)
- 8. Franklin County Multi-County Narcotics and Violent Crimes Enforcement Unit (MCNVCEU)
- 9. Greene County Combined Ozarks Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Team (COMET)
- 10. Grundy County Northwest MO Interagency Team Response Operation (NITRO) Task Force
- 11. Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force (JCDTF)
- 12. Jasper County Ozarks Drug Enforcement Team (ODET)
- 13. Jefferson County Municipal Enforcement Group (JCMEG)
- 14. Lafayette County Narcotics Unit (LCNU)
- 15. Marion City Northeast Missouri (NEMO) Narcotics Task Force
- 16. Morgan County Mid-Missouri (Mid-MO) Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- 17. Poplar Bluff Southeast Missouri (SEMO) Drug Task Force
- 18. St. Charles County Regional Drug Task Force (SCCRDTF)
- 19. St. Louis County Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- 20. Vernon County Community Narcotics Enforcement Team (CNET)
- 21. West Plains City South Central Drug Task Force

JACKSON COUNTY - DRUG ABATEMENT RESPONSE TEAM (DART): This project continues support to DART, a multi-jurisdictional initiative to identify and shut down drug houses and street level narcotics operations in thirteen municipal jurisdictions in Jackson County. DART provides an interagency mechanism through which residents in Jackson County, Missouri, can report illegal narcotics activity within their respective communities. The goal of this program is to eliminate illegal drug activity in the Jackson County community by coordinating and utilizing several sources. Through these efforts, the quality of life in the target area is restored and protected. Suspected drug activity can be anonymously reported to DART members who then communicate the information to law enforcement for investigation. DART also coordinates street level investigations, buy/bust and reverse sting operations, property fire and housing code inspections of suspected drug houses, and notification of drug activity and its consequences to property owners. Property owner seminars, community presentations, and citizen training given on recognition of drug activities are provided by DART members.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Number of citizen reports of drug activity received by DART
- Number of drug houses and drug distribution operations closed
- Number of property owners trained on drug activity recognition
- Number of buy/bust/reverse sting operations coordinated with Patrol officers, community police, and prosecutors
- Number of property fire hazard and building code inspections completed, and number of notifications of drug activity made to property owners
- Number of community organizations given drug awareness presentations or training
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of this project

## **Drug Task Force (DTF) Quarterly Status Report:**

| Organization  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
|---|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| The following question pertains to  | the curren   | t reporting p  | eriod.        |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Number of agencies within   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| force's direct service area<br>the reporting  |              | City           | County        | State F             | ederal                 |                                       |  |
| The following question pertains to  | the curren   | t reporting p  | eriod and/or  | r continuously fro  | m previous reporting   | periods of the current grant.         |  |
| Number of agencies signin<br>with the ta  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
|   |              | City           | County        |                     | ederal                 |                                       |  |
| The following question pertains to  |              | t reporting p  | erioa ana/or  | r continuousiy tro  | m previous reporting   | periods of the current grant.         |  |
| Number of agencies por<br>resources (personnel, co<br>and/or direct equipment<br>ta | irrency,     | City           | County        | State F             | ederal                 |                                       |  |
| The following question pertains to  |              | t reporting p  | eriod and/or  | r continuously fro  | om previous reporting  | periods of the current grant.         |  |
| Number of agencies not p  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| resources (personnel, cu<br>and/or direct equipment                                 | t) to the    | City           | County        | State F             | ederal                 |                                       |  |
| ta  | sk force     | ,              |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Employees   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Identify the number of employees  | directly as: | sianed to the  | task force o  | during the report   | ing period. Count eac  | h individual only once.               |  |
|   |              |                |               |                     |                        | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |  |
| And then of the identified employee Row   |              |                |               |                     | Part-Time Sworr        | Part-Time Non-Sworn                   | Detached to Federal Task Force             |
| Assigned from National Guard  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Funded by COPS  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Funded by DPS Narcotic Grants   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Funded by HIDTA   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Loaned to Task Force  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
|   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Funded by Other Source  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Employee Breakdown - Fu If you identified "funded by other so                       |              |                |               | be the source of    | funding relative to ea | ch identified position.               |  |
|   |              |                |               |                     |                        | *                                     |  |
| Casa Astivity   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Case Activity  A case is initiated when a suspect is shall constitute a case.       | s identified | l resulting in | an investiga  | ative case file. Ar | n investigation may in | clude more than one suspect, a        | and in this event, each identified suspect |
| Do not count tips and intelligence in   | nformation   | for which for  | llow-un law e | enforcement acti    | ion was not initiated  |                                       |  |
| Number of new cases i   | initiated    |                | ion apian (   | omoroomon dos       | on was not milated.    |                                       |  |
| Number of assists in cases i  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| by other law enforcement a<br>during the reporting                                  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Arrest Activity   |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| An arrest is considered drug-related  | d if the cas | e was initiate | ed as a resu  | ılt of a drug inves | stigation.             |                                       |  |
| Non-drug related arrests can be pr  | ovided in t  | he "Narrative  | e"section at  | the bottom of the   | e report.              |                                       |  |
| Number of individuals arre<br>drug-related charge:<br>reporting                     | s during     |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Of the number of drug-<br>arrests, how many were for<br>indi                        |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Of the number of drug-<br>arrests, how many were f                                  |              |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Of the number of drug-<br>arrests, how many v<br>ordinance vio                      | were for     |                |               |                     |                        |                                       |  |

| Drug Buys, Reverse Drug Buys,  | Free Samples, and Informant Expenses   |         |
|--|--|---------|
| Number of drug buys made during<br>the reporting period  |  |         |
| Amount spent on drug buys during the reporting period  | 90.00  |         |
| Number of reverse drug buys made<br>during the reporting period  |  |         |
| Amount of cash received/seized<br>from reverse drug buys during the<br>reporting period  | \$0.00   |         |
| Number of free samples received during the reporting period  |  |         |
| Dollar value (estimate) of drug<br>received from free samples during<br>the reporting period, based on loca<br>street value at time receiver | \$0.00   |         |
| Amount expended on informants<br>during the reporting period   |  |         |
| Drug Buys and Free Sample Bre  | akdown   |         |
|  | ne "Drug Buys, Reverse Drug Buys, Free Samples, and Informant Expenses" section, identify the quantity of drugs acquired throug  | ih drug |
| Amounts should be reported in the measure  | ement identified for each drug type and based on the suspected drug type; do not wait for scientific lab examination results.  |         |
| Quantities can be entered with up to 4 decin   | ·  |         |
| Cocaine-Crack (grams)  | 0  |         |
| Cocaine-Powder (grams)   | 0  |         |
| Ecstasy/MDMA (grams)   | 0  |         |
| Hallucinogens - LSD (doses)  | 0  |         |
| Hallucinogens - PCP (grams)  | 0  |         |
| Heroin (grams)   | 0  |         |
| Marijuana (grams)  | 0  |         |
| Methamphetamine (grams)  | 0  |         |
| Prescription Pills (doses/pills)   | O  List the type(s) of prescription pills and its relative quantity.   |         |
| Pseudoephedrine/Ephedrine<br>(grams)   | 0  |         |
| Synthetics (grams)   | 0  |         |
| Other (grams)  |  |         |
|  | List the type(s) of "other" drug and its relative quantity.  |         |
| Search Warrants  |  |         |
| Number of search warrants applied for during the reporting period  |  |         |
| Number of search warrants served during the reporting period   |  |         |
| Of the search warrants served<br>during the reporting period, how<br>many resulted in drug and/o   |  |         |
| paraphernalia seizures<br>Number of consent searches<br>conducted during the reporting   |  |         |
| period   |  |         |
| Marijuana Eradicated   |  |         |
| Number of indoor cultivated plants<br>eradicted during the reporting<br>perior   |  |         |
| Number of outdoor cultivated<br>plants eradicted during the<br>reporting period  |  |         |
| Methamphetamine Labs   |  |         |
|  | glassware/equipment seizures, and dumpsites and is supported by the completion of the "National Clandestine Laboratory Seizu<br>1 143). Labs not supported by the completion of this form should not be included in the count. | ire     |
| Number of meth labs seized during<br>the reporting period  |  |         |
| the reporting period   |  |         |

| Drug Seizure Value   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
|--|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Identify the value of drug seized, whether through interdiction (pa<br>arrests. Do not include seizures from drug buys and free sample               |              | icle) methods or  | through non-interdiction     | n methods, as a result o  | of search warrants, consent searches, and  |
| Estimated dollar value of drugs<br>seized through interdiction<br>methods, based on local street<br>cost, during the reporting period                |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Estimated dollar value of drugs seized through non-interdiction methods, based on local street   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| cost, during the reporting period  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Drug Seizure Breakdown   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Based on the amounts identified above in the "Drug Seizure Val<br>interdiction methods, as a result of search warrants, consent sear                 |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Report amounts in the identified measurement based on the gro  | ss amount    | at the time of se | izure.                       |                           |  |
| Quantities can be entered with up to 4 decimal places.   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Row  |              | Interdiction      | Seizure Method               |                           | nterdiction Seizure Method                 |
| Cocaine-Crack (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Cocaine-Powder (grams)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Ecstasy/MDMA (grams)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Hallucinogens - LSD (doses)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Hallucinogens - PCP (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Heroin (grams)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Marijuana (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Methamphetamine (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Prescription Pills (doses/pills)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Psilocybin (grams)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Synthetics (grams)   | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Other (grams)  | 0            |                   |                              | 0                         |  |
| Drug Seizure Breakdown - Other Drugs   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| If you identified "other" drugs seized as a result of a search warra   | nt, consent  | search, or arres  | st, list the drug type(s) an | d its relative quantity.  |  |
|  |              |                   |                              | ^                         |  |
|  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
|  |              |                   |                              | T                         |  |
| Education (Taxining Document   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Education/Training Programs  Identify the number of drug-related education/training programs   | nrovided d   | luring the report | ing period and the numb      | per of attendees to which | ch such aducation/training programs were   |
| provided. If attendance at the program was not recorded and the  |              |                   |                              |                           | ar outer caucations and an imprograms were |
| Row  |              | N                 | umber Provided               |                           | Number of Attendees                        |
| Businesses   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| General Public/Civic Organizations   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Law Enforcement Agencies   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Schools  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Other  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Community Involvement  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Community prevention programs include, but are not limited to,   | coalitions.  | prescription take | e-back events, neighbor      | hood watch programs.      | and town hall meetings.                    |
| If applicable, describe the community prevention programs(s) for level of involvement should be based on whether the task force coordinated program. |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
| Was the task force involved in any community prevention programs during the reporting period?  |              |                   |                              |                           | *  |
| ⊚ Yes ⊚ No   |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
|  |              |                   |                              |                           |  |
|  | If No, enter | N/A. If Yes, iden | tify the community prevent   | tion program(s) and desc  | ribe the level of involvement.             |

| Rehabilitation  |   |
|---|---|
| Rehabilitation programs include, but are not limited to, drug cou                       | rt and treatment programs.  |
|   | he task force was involved during the reporting period and the level of involvement by the task force. The level of ated the program, assisted in the coordination of the program, or merely participated in the already coordinated                |
| Was the task force involved in any rehabilitation programs during the reporting period? |   |
| ⊚ Yes ⊚ No  |   |
|   |   |
|   | If No, enter N/A. If Yes, identify the rehabilitation program(s) and describe the level of involvement.   |
| Narrative   |   |
| Narrauve  |   |
|   | force project during the reporting period not reported in the above sections and/or provide any details necessary to<br>s. In addition, if the task force project faced any obstacles during the reporting period that affected the activity of the |
| Font Family ▼ Font Size ▼ B I <u>U</u>   ≣ ≣ ≣  | 注   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
| Path:   | Words:0   |

## PROSECUTION AND COURT PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

This purpose area provides financial assistance to implement and enhance the response of criminal justice agencies to criminal activity. Training of law enforcement, prosecution, and judicial staff on handling or processing criminal cases as well as establishment of communication between involved criminal justice agencies leads to effective problem resolution.

Efficiency evaluations designed for:

NO PROGRAMS FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR

## PREVENTION AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

This purpose area provides supplies and reference materials to Missouri law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials to help them promote safety and educate officers and the public on issues that affect themselves and the environment.

## Efficiency evaluation designed for:

• Missouri Department of Natural Resources - Clandestine Drug Laboratory Collection Station

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES - CLANDESTINE DRUG LABORATORY COLLECTION STATION: This continuing project supports the Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Services Program in responding to methamphetamine clandestine laboratory clean-up requests. The goal of this project is to increase safety and reduce risk of injury to the staff, the public, and the environment exposed to clandestine laboratories. This goal will be achieved by completing four objectives: 1) Provide proper supplies and reference material to Missouri law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials; 2) Provide supplies for processing and disposal of clandestine drug lab materials to clandestine drug laboratory collection stations; 3) Provide on-site responses to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents, when requested by law enforcement, fire station, and other emergency officials; and 4) Provide emergency response, hazardous materials, and health and safety training to Missouri law enforcement, fire, service, and other emergency response officials to help them safely enter and dismantle clandestine drug lab incidents.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Amount and type of supplies purchased specifically to reduce methamphetamine laboratory related injuries of emergency responders
- Number of injury and non-injury related laboratory incidents responded to
- Amount and type of supplies purchased specifically for processing and disposal of clandestine drug laboratory materials from clandestine drug laboratory collection stations
- Number of requests for on-site assistance to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents by type of requestor (law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials)
- Number of on-site responses to requests for assistance to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents, by type of requestor (law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials)
- Other major work effort and activities performed under auspices of the project

## CORRECTIONS AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAM PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

Corrections Programs aim to supervise offenders and prepare them for return to their communities. Correctional agencies give inmates opportunities to develop life and work skills that will help their return be successful and are using treatment, work, education, and mental health programs to build these skills. Community based corrections is a criminal corrections option that provides an offender with sanctions, supervision, and treatment in a community setting instead of prison

Efficiency evaluation designed for:

NO PROGRAMS FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR

## DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

Drug Treatment Programs identify and meet the treatment needs of adult and juvenile drug dependent and alcohol-dependent offenders. Such programs can include behavioral therapy such as counseling, and cognitive therapy, or psychotherapy, medication, or a combination of both and are intended to provide intensive assistance to those individuals that are battling a substance abuse addiction.

### Efficiency evaluation designed for:

• Stone County Prosecuting Attorney - Drug/Alcohol Offender Program

#### STONE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY - DRUG / ALCOHOL OFFENDER PROGRAM:

This continuing project supports the Stone County Prosecuting Attorney's office innovative approach to prosecution/treatment for alcohol/drug offenders. This program will utilize a four track approach which include, 1) misdemeanor offenders age 17 to 25 given the lack of alternatives for this group; 2) enhanced probation for felony offenders through a combination of Probation and Parole and the prosecutor's office; 3) deferred prosecution involving monitoring and supervision through the prosecutor's office; and 4) Drug Court for the serious addict.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Timely implementation of Stone County drug court
- Number of drug / alcohol offenders participating in drug court
- Number of offenders successfully completing drug court
- Number of drug test given and percent of positive test results
- Number of cases monitored by prosecutor's office as part of this program
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

## PLANNING, EVALUATION, AND TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

State and local criminal justice agencies must be automated if their reporting to the State Central Repository is to be timely, accurate, and complete. When local agencies are automated and linked to the State Repository, they are able to search federal criminal files, state and federal wanted files, and other databases. Criminal justice databases are important tools when fighting crime and protecting citizens.

In addition, the acquisition of technology is vital for departments to operate efficiently and effectively.

#### Efficiency evaluation designed for:

• Missouri State Highway Patrol - Administrative Data Analysis & Problem (ADAP) Identification

MO STATE HIGHWAY PATROL (MSHP) - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA ANALYSIS & PROBLEM (ADAP) IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM: This continuing project involves establishing a series of policies, procedures, systems, and reporting recommendations. The State of Missouri will effectively manage the JAG Program by analyzing drug and violent crime environments in the State; assessing effectiveness of existing programs; and offering data and interpretive analysis support for development of new programs. The MSHP, coordinating their activities with DPS's CJ/LE Program staff, will complete the following project goals: 1) Provide base-line information to properly assess Missouri's illicit drug and violent crime problems; and 2) Support successful administration of Missouri's JAG Program by providing needed research, evaluation, and data processing services.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and support services employed to implement the project.
- Assistance provided in successful development and/or modification of Missouri's drug and violent crime strategy required under the JAG Program including, but not limited to, conducting a statewide illicit drug and violent crime problem analysis and developing an annual grant report
- Number of research services provided to DPS, Missouri criminal justice authorities, and other public officials
- Assistance provided in development and implementation of evaluation criteria and information systems for programs supported under the JAG Program. Publication of a report describing all approved evaluation designs
- Completion of management, statistical, and project monitoring reports based on multijurisdictional drug task force, crime lab, and cybercrime multi-jurisdictional task force quarterly progress reports.
- Other major work effort and activities performed under auspices of this project

## CRIME VICTIM AND WITNESS PROGRAMS PROGRESS EVALUATION DESIGNS

Crime victim and victim witness programs are designed to provide crime victims, witnesses, and jurors with services while involved in the criminal justice system. Victim programs are geared to help deal with feelings of confusion, frustration, fear, and anger and explain victims or witnesses of their rights. Other activities include advocacy for victims who encounter difficulty while accessing services or who believe their statutory or constitutional rights were denied. Victim programs also provide notification and assistance to victims whose offenders have parole potential.

Efficiency evaluation designed for:

NO PROGRAMS FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR